

REMARKS

Applicants have made minor amendments to the claims so that the punctuation in the claims is consistent and to ensure that there is an antecedent basis for the terms in the claims. These amendments are not in response to any objection or rejection by the Examiner, nor has the scope of the claims been changed. Accordingly, it is requested that each of these amendments be entered.

Applicants will now address each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

Claim Objections

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner objects to Claim 58, 79-84, 55, 64, 73, 75, 82 and 84 for informalities therein. In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended or canceled these claims. These amendments and cancellation of claims are being made for clarity purposes and are not in response to a patentability rejection, and therefore, are not intended to narrow the scope of the claims.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments made herein overcome the Examiner's objections. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

The Examiner also has the following rejections under 35 USC §102:

- A. Claims 67-70 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Yokomizu (JP 10-073813).
- B. Claims 67-70 72 and 74 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated

by Okubo et al. (US 4,470,667).

- C. Claims 67-69 and 71-74 are rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Fujioka et al. (US 6,552,764).
- D. Claims 67-70 and 74 are rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Ikeda et al. (US 6,671,025).

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

While these rejections are respectfully traversed, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended independent Claim 67 to recite the features of “wherein the light shielding portion is formed overlapping a channel forming region of a switching element provided over a substrate; wherein the light shielding portion is provided under an opposing substrate; and, wherein a liquid crystal is between said light shielding portion and said channel forming region; wherein a pixel electrode electrically with the switching element comprises a transparent conductive film; and, wherein said light shielding portion does not include said third colored layer.”

Applicants respectfully submit that these features are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, independent Claim 67 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner also has the following rejections under 35 USC §103:

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20-23, 25-27, 29-32 and 34

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20-23, 25-27, 29-32 and 34 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al. in view of Fujioka. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 1, 8, 21 and 25 recite that the liquid crystal is between a light shielding portion and a channel forming region. It is respectfully submitted that this feature is not disclosed in Ikeda nor in the combination of references in the rejection (even if the combination is proper, which Applicants do not admit). For similar reasons, independent Claims 13 and 29, which recite that the liquid crystal is between the light shielding portion and the region between the first pixel electrode and a second pixel electrode adjacent to said first pixel electrode, is also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

As these features are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, independent Claims 1, 8, 13, 21, 25 and 29 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 7, 12, 19, 24, 28 and 33

Claims 7, 12, 19, 24, 28 and 33 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda in view of Fujioka and further in view of Ogawa et al. (US 5,373,377). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated herein for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 43-48

The Examiner also rejects Claims 43-48 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al. in view of Fujikawa (US 6,002,463) and further in view of Ukai et al. (US 5,576,858). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated herein for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Further, while Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Claims 43-48 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that Ukai (and the other cited references) fail to teach or suggest the claimed features of “a source line connected with the switching element electrically; an insulating film over said source line; a gate wiring over said insulating film; and a liquid crystal over said gate wiring” as recited in Claims 43-48.

Furthermore, in the Final Rejection, the Examiner contends that 8G in Fig. 8 of Ukai is a gate wiring. However, Ukai clearly states that 8G is a gate electrode. See col. 8, ln.65.

Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest the claimed invention, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 75

The Examiner also rejects Claim 75 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujioka et al. in view of Ukai et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated herein for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. This claim is also patentable over the cited references for similar reasons to that discussed above for Claims 43-48.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 76-78 and 80-83

The Examiner also rejects Claims 76-78 and 80-83 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujioka et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

As explained above, Fujioka does not disclose or suggest the features of independent Claim 67. For similar reasons, it also does not disclose or suggest the features of independent Claim 76.

For example, while Fujioka discloses a LCD having a shielding portion of laminated three color over TFT in Fig. 17, Fujioka fails to disclose or suggest a portable telephone wherein the pixel electrode is made of a transparent conductive film, as in independent Claim 76.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 76-79

The Examiner also rejects Claims 76-79 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokomizu. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

As explained above, Yokomizu does not disclose or suggest the features of independent Claim 67. For similar reasons, it also does not disclose the features of independent Claim 76.

For example, while Yokomizu discloses a LCD having a shielding portion of laminated three color filters, Yokomizu fails to disclose or suggest the feature of wherein said light shielding portion does not include said third colored layer, as in independent Claim 76.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 84

The Examiner also rejects Claim 84 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Fujioka et al. in view of Ukai et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated herein for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. This claim is also patentable over the cited references for similar reasons to that discussed above for Claims 43-48.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 49-51 and 53-56

The Examiner further rejects Claims 49-51 and 53-56 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujioka et al. and further in view of Kaneko et al. (US 5,637,380). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For example, while Fujioka discloses a LCD having a shielding portion of laminated three color over TFT in Fig. 17, Fujioka fails to disclose or suggest the feature of wherein the electro-optical device is a transmissive liquid crystal display device in which the pixel electrode is made of a transparent conductive film, as in independent Claim 49.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 49-52

The Examiner further rejects Claims 49-52 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Yokomizu and further in view of Kaneko et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For example, while Yokomizu discloses a LCD having a shielding portion of laminated three color filters, Yokomizu does not disclose or suggest the feature of wherein said light shielding portion does not include said third colored layer, as in independent Claim 49.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 57

The Examiner also rejects Claim 57 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujioka et al. in view of Kaneko et al. in view of Ukai et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated herein for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. This claim is also patentable over the cited references for similar reasons to that discussed above for Claims 43-48.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 58-60 and 62-65

The Examiner also rejects Claims 58-60 and 62-65 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujioka et al. and further in view of Ichikawa et al. (US 6,339,459). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of these references is improper. While Fujioka discloses a LCD having laminated color filters, Ichikawa discloses a LCD without a color filter (see e.g. field of invention in Ichikawa). Hence, there would be no motivation for one skilled in the art to combine Fujioka and Ichikawa. Therefore, since the proper motivation to combine references is lacking, this combination and rejection is improper, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 58-61

The Examiner also rejects Claims 58-61 and 62-65 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokomizu and further in view of Ichikawa et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of these references is improper. While Yokomizu discloses a LCD having laminated color filters, Ichikawa discloses a LCD without a color filter (see e.g. field of invention in Ichikawa). Hence, there would be no motivation for one skilled in the art to combine Yokomizu and Ichikawa. Therefore, since the proper motivation to combine references is lacking, this combination and rejection is improper, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 66

The Examiner also rejects Claim 66 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujioka in view of Ichikawa et al. in view of Ukai et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated herein for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. This claim is also patentable over the cited references for similar reasons to that discussed above for Claims 43-48.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee is due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:



Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 000026568